

REMARKS

Claims 29, 31-33 and 35-40, as amended, remain herein. Claims 29 and 33 have been amended. Page 11, lines 6-12 of applicants' specification provides the added support for the amended claims and specifically for applicants' claimed "decode key."

1. Claims 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The claimed subject matter is supported by the specification, in Fig. 6A and page 10, lines 30-35, which describe applicants' claimed "accounting information," and Figs. 6A, 6B and page 8, line 28 to page 9, line 3, which describe applicants' claimed "certain information." Thus, withdrawal of these rejections are requested.

2. Claims 29, 31-33, 35-39 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over O'Boyle '329, Tanabe '767 and Arij '776. None of the cited references teaches or suggests applicants' claimed "cipher key recorded in the form of strip patterns extending along a radius of the optical disk" and "encoding with the cipher key accounting information associated with a user account," as recited in claims 29 and 33.

The Office Action cites encryption measures described in O'Boyle '329. However, there is no description in O'Boyle '329 that encryption of data is performed with a key read from a card 30. In O'Boyle '329, after an account identification number is encrypted, the encrypted account access identification number is recorded onto a card through magnetic and optical recording. Then the encrypted signal recorded onto the card is read out magnetically and optically, and the two read

out signals are combined to reproduce the encrypted signal. After that, the reproduced encrypted signal is compared with an encrypted signal recorded in a designated storage area. If the reproduced encrypted signal and the signal encrypted recorded in the storage area match, the card is determined to be valid See O'Boyle '329, col. 10, lines 41-44. Thus, O'Boyle '329 describes only encryption of data without reading keys stored in a data storage medium.

Further, the placement of applicants' claimed "cipher key" and "identification information" in the optical disk provides obvious benefits. Without the physical presence of the optical disk, no reproduction of content stored in the disk takes place, according to applicants' claims 29 and 33. For example, a third party without a valid disk cannot decode any accounting information, since the decode key corresponding to the identification information is stored in the same optical disk. This is in contrast with O'Boyle '329 which determines the validity of the card 30 by directly comparing the read encrypted signal and the encrypted signal recorded on the storage area. Thus, in O'Boyle '329, the authenticity of the card 30 is determined without the presence of the card 30.

Tanabe '767 and Arii '776 likewise fail to provide the deficiencies of O'Boyle '329.

Thus, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of O'Boyle '329, Tanabe '767 or Arii '776 of all elements of applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in O'Boyle '329, Tanabe '767 or Arii '776 that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. Still further, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of these references, and no other basis in this record, that would have suggested the desirability of combining or modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or render obvious applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these

grounds of rejection, and allowance of all claims 29, 31-33, and 35-40 are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all claims 29, 31-33, 35-40 are now fully in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP



Roger W. Parkhurst
Reg. No. 25,177
Daniel W. Shim
Reg. No. 56,995

Date: March 30, 2009

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-3000
Fax: (202) 429-3902

Attorney Docket No.: 28951.2011 C12